DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 247 646 EA 017 014

AUTHOR Roe, Ellen; And Others
TITLE This Effective Schools Plan Is an Urban Educational Success.
PUB DATE 1 Apr 84
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National School Boards Association (Houston, TX, March 31-April 3, 1984).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; Discussion Groups; *Educational Assessment; *Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Criteria; Participative Decision Making; *Policy Formation; Program Implementation; Relevance (Education); Research Utilization; *School Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS Decision Seminars; *Seattle Public Schools WA

ABSTRACT

The Seattle Public Schools' effort to define and establish effective schools is described in this paper, a transcript of four coordinated presentations. Ellen Roe, the first presenter, recounts the design of the project. Planning, she states, was begun in late 1981 by a decision seminar (comprised of teachers, administrators, a community representative, and a school board member), which reviewed literature and testimony, proposed policies to the board, and--reconvening in spring 1983 and winter 1984--evaluated the planning process. T. J. Vassar then outlines 12 characteristics of school effectiveness identified by the seminar and describes the school board policy based on them, which was adopted in April 1982. Richard L. Andrews, after commenting on the current school effectiveness debate, proposes a seven-step process for improving American schools and lists means of measuring Vassar's 12 characteristics. Finally, Donald J. Steele, Jr. (the district superintendent during this project) summarizes the first three presentations, outlines the challenges in planning and implementing an effective schools project, and lists the project's four premises and seven component tasks. (MCG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ellen Roe

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED247646

"THIS 'EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS' PLAN IS AN URBAN EDUCATIONAL SUCCESS"

A presentation to the
National School Boards Association
April 1, 1984

Presentators

Ellen Roe
T. J. Vassar
Dr. Richard Andrews
Dr. Donald Steele

EA 017 014

SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Administrative and Service Center
815 Fourth Avenue North
Seattle, Washington 98109

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PRESENTATION

National School Boards Association
April 1, 1984
by
Ellen Roe

INTRODUCTION

We are pleased to be able to describe to all of you what we considered to be an outstanding process through which our School District, with community participants, arrived at our definition of the effective schools. Schools that would serve all our students.

Inasmuch as I served on the seminar, I will describe the process and our activities.

My fellow Board member, T. J. Vassar, who is Vice-President, will describe the Twelve Characteristics of an Effective School and the new Board policies that were adopted. Dr. Richard Andrews, Professor at the University of Washington College of Education, will outline the process being completed for measuring how well the schools are achieving the effective school characteristics. Dr. Don Steele, who was Superintendent of Seattle Schools when the seminar process was carried out, will describe how the process was implemented and where we go from here.

Our presentation will take about 40 minutes, and we will then open the floor to questions.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROCESS

When Dr. Steele arrived in Seattle, he described to the Board a decision seminar process he had designed based on the work of Harold Laswell, a former political theorist at Yale Law School, who conceived the idea and Dr. LuVerne Cunningham, a Professor of Educational Administration at Ohio State University, who adopted the process to K-12 schools.

Dr. Steele felt it would help our District achieve concensus about how to accomplish some major changes in our schools. Seattle has an extremely active citizenry, and involved teachers and principals organizations, who wanted and needed to participate in arriving at ways to make each of our schools better.

The first seminar was carried out in the fall of 1981 around the issue of discipline. A 13 member group of teachers, citizen, Board member and administrators interviewed dozens of interested people and groups and arrived at a number of recommended policy additions and changes which were adopted by the Board.

The second seminar subject was chosen as a result of several visits by Professor Ron Edmonds (former Harvard Education Professor) who visited Seattle on several occasions in late summer and fall of 1981. Mr. Edmonds used his definition of effective school criteria to help improve the education of urban youth in several New York City schools.

Effective Schools Presentation
Ellen Roe

In December 1981 the Effective Schools Seminar group convened. The members included: three teachers (one elementary, one middle school and one high school), one elementary principal, one middle school assistant principal, three central office administrators (director elementary education, director of program development, and coordinator of compensatory programs), one community representative who acted as chair, and myself representing the Board. We worked under the direction of Dr. Mary Carson, Assistant Superintendent of Policy and Planning. The members were selected on the following criteria: interest, commitment, objectivity in analysis, receptiveness to a wide range of viewpoints, capable of working as a team, plus of course, ethnic, gender and grade level representation. Each of the members who had a school building responsibility was released from their job for three weeks with a long-term substitute. Meetings were held at the Administrative and Service Center in the Board's conference room, and we met daily from 8:30 to 4:30. Materials, charts, etc., soon filled the room and walls. Each day was divided into 15 minute segments, rigorously timed, to gather information. Our data collection included the following:

A. Small group or individual members of the seminar reading and reporting to the group. Among the materials reviewed were:

   1) Alaska Governor's Task Force on Effective Schools.

   2) Ron Edmond's research on instructionally effective schools.

   3) John Goodlad's materials on schooling.

   4) Fifteen Thousand Hours, a longitudinal study of London High Schools.

B. Sponsoring community meetings on what is school effectiveness. (93 in attendance)

C. Reviewing state, District, and national data.

D. Two open hearings with teachers.

E. A meeting with student leaders in Inter-High Council.

F. Testimony and presentations from teachers, other staff, parents, citizens, and students. (69 individuals and groups)

G. Listening to invited experts including:

   1) Robert Blum, Northwest Regional Laboratory.

   2) Wilbur Brookover, Michigan State University.

3) Seattle University and University of Washington staff members.

Information and insights from all thse sources were debated and discussed. The following represents the best thinking of the seminar based on this enormous amount of interesting and sometimes contradictory information.

The seminar members then identified the problems in general and divided into small groups to outline the problems. Once those were agreed to by the whole group, we divided again and wrote draft recommendations to solve the problems. Once general consensus was achieved, several of us wrote draft policies which were agreed to by the group. The major writing tasks were well divided, but the editing and completion of the report were done by Dr. Carson.

At the conclusion of the task force work, the report was presented by the group to the School Board and top administrators. Seminar members presented the report and provided an opportunity to have questions answered and issues clarified. A similar presentation was then made to a principals meeting.

I will not go into detail on the report, but I think this paragraph might describe the seminar group's feelings.

> We offer our report with a great deal of respect for the overall quality of the Seattle program, and for the lively interest and commitment of the community to education. We believe firmly that the challenge of the 80's in Seattle schools is to reach a higher degree of performance from students and staff, and a higher quality of partnership between school and community. To begin meeting the challenge, we offer this report.

The Board then adopted its own process for formal action on the proposed policies which took about eight weeks and included several hearings and lively discussions in Board meetings.

In the spring of 1983 and again in the winter of 1984, the seminar was reconvened to assess the planning to implement effective schools. The product of the spring 1983 sessions was the first update report which contained recommendations on the operational definitions and the effective schools program in general. The results of the winter 1984 session just completed resulted in a second update report. Both reports are advisory recommendations to the Superintendent.

The second report pertains to selected parts of the Effective Schools programs, and contains general recommendations on the Effective Schools program and process. It also has proposals on intervention programs designed to help low achievers, a public relations plan, and the Effective Schools Project. Lastly, it critiques and make recommendations on the instruments designed by our various committees to assess school effectiveness.

Effective Schools Presentation
Ellen Roe

* * * * *

Mr. Vassar will now present the seminars' 12 effective schools characteristics and the policies adopted in April, 1982.

* * * * *

Dr. Richard Andrews will outline the University's role in assisting the school district personnel in measuring how well the schools are achieving the Effective School Characteristics.

* * * * *

Dr. Steele will briefly outline the implementation process designed by staff. (seven tasks, etc.)

* * * * *

CHARACTERISTICS OF AN EFFECTIVE SCHOOL IN SEATTLE

T. J. Vassar

Considerable consistency exists in the research on the Characteristics of an Effective School. The Seattle Community goes beyond the research by including all students instead of only focusing on low achievers, by expanding the number of characteristics, and by emphasizing involvement and responsibility of community and schools.

For the Effective School in Seattle, all of the following characteristics must be present.

1. Clear Goals
   - Goals are limited in number.
   - Schools are clear about their goals.
   - Staff, students, and community can express the goals.
   - Time and money are devoted to accomplishing the goals.
2. Strong Leadership
   - The principal is the instructional leader.
   - The principal is dedicated to the goals of the school and the District.
   - The principal is able to rally and mobilize all resources to accomplish the goals.
3. Dedicated Staff
   - Work as a team at a high professional level.
   - Understand and accept the goals, philosophy, rules, and procedures or the school.
   - Exhibit positive morale and enthusiasm for their work.
4. High Expectations
   - Schools demonstrate high expectations for each student.
   - Students have high expectations for themselves.
   - When expectations are high, better performance results.
5. Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress
   - Schools are constantly aware of student progress in relationship to instructional objectives.

5. Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress (continued)

- Test results are used to:

  a) provide feedback to students on their performance
  b) inform parents of students progress and needs
  c) individualize remediation
  d) improve curriculum and teaching methods

6. Early Identification

- Learning difficulties are identified early.
- Remedial assistance is directed at correcting special difficulties.

7. A Positive Learning Climate

- The atmosphere is orderly and quite without being rigid and oppressive.
- The climate is warm and responsive.
- Students, staff and parents feel welcome and free to grow.

8. Time-On-Task

- In Seattle, Time-On-Task refers to time on task for everyone involved--students, staff, administration, the Board, the community.
- The more time spent on instruction, the greater the learning.
- The more time spent on improvement of instruction, the more improvement will result.
- The more time devoted to the instruction mission by the parents/community, the better the school will be.

9. Curriculum Continuity

- The District prescribed curriculum is followed.
- The principal knows and monitors the use of the curriculum.
- The same basic subject matter is taught in each school in the same grade.
- Speciality teachers utilize District curriculum, teach the same objectives, provide extra time for mainstreamed students, and work with regular classroom teachers to assist individual students in mastery.

10. Multicultural Education

- Significant cultural content is integrated into the regular curriculum.
- Multiple cultures are recognized in every classroom and activity.

11. Communication

- Staff, students, community, and the District are informed of school affairs.
- Teachers interact directly with parents and students.
- The principal is open and receptive to all concerns.
- Principals and staff are informed in advance of major District activities.

12. Parent/Community Involvement

- Parents/community are involved in meaningful ways.
- Volunteers are welcomed, encouraged, and used productively.
- Community resources are utilized to further the community/school partnership.
- School planning involves staff with community in collaborative relationships.

CES.1-CES.3

SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Effective Schools Seminar - Board Adopted Policies

SCHOOL BOARD GOALS — Policy #B 01.00

IT IS THE POLICY OF THE SEATTLE SCHOOL BOARD TO PROVIDE DIRECTION TO THE SUPERINTENDENT THROUGH THE ANNUAL ADOPTION OF GOALS AND PRIORITIES FOR THE SCHOOL DISTRICT. SUCH GOALS AND PRIORITIES SHALL BE ADOPTED EACH YEAR IN TIME TO PROVIDE DIRECTION TO BUDGET PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATIVE PREPLANNING FOR THE FOLLOWING SCHOOL YEAR.

HIGH EXPECTATIONS — Policy #C 06.00

IT IS THE POLICY OF THE SEATTLE SCHOOL BOARD, THE ADMINISTRATION, TEACHERS, STUDENTS, STAFF, AND PUBLIC TO DEVELOP HIGH EXPECTATIONS OF THEMSELVES AND THE SEATTLE SCHOOL DISTRICT. TEACHERS' HIGH EXPECTATIONS FOR STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE IS OF UTMOST IMPORTANCE IN ACHIEVING ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE FOR EACH INDIVIDUAL STUDENT.

COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITY (Revision) — Policy #F 04.00

IT IS THE POLICY OF THE SEATTLE SCHOOL BOARD TO PROMOTE THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM THROUGH THE DISTRIBUTION OF APPROPRIATE, TIMELY INFORMATION TO STAFF, CITIZENS, AGENCIES, INSTITUTIONS, AND PUBLIC BODIES.

USE OF VOLUNTEERS (Revision) — Policy #F 12.00

IT IS THE POLICY OF THE SEATTLE SCHOOL BOARD TO ACTIVELY ENCOURAGE AND ASSIST VOLUNTEERS IN ALL SCHOOLS, AS VALUABLE RESOURCES IN ASSISTING THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM.

PARTNERSHIP WITH PARENTS — Policy #F 13.00

IT IS THE POLICY OF THE SEATTLE SCHOOL BOARD TO OPERATE IN PARTNERSHIP WITH PARENTS IN PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTING THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM.

COMMUNITY COOPERATION — Policy #F 14.00

IT IS THE POLICY OF THE SEATTLE SCHOOL BOARD TO COOPERATE WITH SEATTLE'S VARIOUS COMMUNITIES - BUSINESS, ACADEMIC, RELIGIOUS, ARTS, VOLUNTEERS, AND ETHNIC/CULTURAL - AS PARTNERS IN THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS AND AS MAJOR EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES.

COURSE OF STUDY ADOPTION (Revision) — Policy #G 02.00

IT IS THE POLICY OF THE SEATTLE SCHOOL BOARD TO ADOPT AND IMPLEMENT A BROAD COURSE OF STUDY DESIGNED TO SERVE THE NEEDS OF STUDENTS IN THIS URBAN, DIVERSE COMMUNITY. NO COURSE OF STUDY OR COURSE SHALL BE ADDED OR ELIMINATED WITHOUT APPROVAL OF THE BOARD NOR SHALL ANY BASIC ALTERATION OR REDUCTION OF A COURSE OF STUDY BE MADE WITHOUT SUCH APPROVAL.

DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF CURRICULUM (Revision) — Policy #G 05.00

IT IS THE POLICY OF THE SEATTLE SCHOOL BOARD TO ASSURE CONSISTENCY AND CONTINUITY IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF CURRICULUM; TO PROVIDE CENTRAL DIRECTION; AND TO HOLD THE TEACHING AND SUPERVISORY STAFF ACCOUNTABLE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CURRICULUM. TO THIS END, THE SAME BASIC PROGRAM WILL BE TAUGHT IN EACH SCHOOL IN THE SAME GRADE IN EACH SUBJECT AREA.

MULTICULTURAL CURRICULUM — Policy #G 08.00

IT IS THE POLICY OF THE SEATTLE SCHOOL BOARD THAT ALL ETHNIC GROUPS IN THE SEATTLE COMMUNITY BE REPRESENTED IN THE DISTRICT CURRICULUM. CONTENT REGARDING THE HISTORY, CULTURE, AND ACHIEVEMENT OF VARIOUS ETHNIC GROUPS WILL BE INTEGRATED INTO THE INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES. REPRESENTATION OF ETHNIC GROUPS AND GENDER MUST BE PRESENT IN TEXTBOOK CONTENT AND PICTURES, ON BULLETIN BOARDS, ON MURALS, IN CULTURAL ARTS ACTIVITIES, AND IN SCHOOL ACTIVITIES.

(over)

HOW DO WE KNOW IF WE HAVE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS?

Richard L. Andrews, Chair
Policy, Governance and Administration
College of Education
University of Washington

Over the past several years there has been an increasing public demand for improving the quality of education of the nation's youth. This demand, reflected most recently in the "Nation at Risk" report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, is not new: the concerns in the Commission's document are strikingly similar to those found in the Committe of Ten report of the National Education Association in 1893.

Although the demand for quality education is not a new phenomenon, the current demand takes on additional signficance when considered in terms of two related developments; (1) the decrease in federal funds for education, and (2) the reordering of the economy and labor force needs, both in terms of technological shifts and changes in international economics.

The society's schooling systems at all levels must respond to the larger societal demands and changing conditions, either to meet projected changing needs, or to reaffirm and urge essential stability in a time of change, or both. The common ingredient of the schools' response, however, must be to provide each child with an instructionally effective school.

There are two interrelated questions which we must pose if we are to meet this challenge. They are: "How do we provide such schools?" And, "How do we know when we have instructionally effective schools?" These questions are not new either; they have plagued educators, parents and school directors since the beginning of the public school system. There is probably not one among us here who has not heard someone say, "Talk to the custodians and secretaries- they can tell you what's going on in this school." "You can tell the quality of a school by simply walking down the halls - if they are clean and empty - it's a good school." "You can tell the quality of a school by walking into the teachers' lounge - if it is bright and cheery - that's a good school." "A good school is one that scores high on academic achievement scores." "You

show me a principal who runs a tight ship, and I'll show you a good school." "If you have a strong principal in a school, you'll have a good school." What is obvious is that the people who are making these statements have formed their own yardstick of what makes a good school. They know what it is and could easily measure it. While such casual observations about what makes a good school may be useful as topics of conversation, they provide little useful information which principals, teachers, and parents can use to make meaningful school improvements.

Over the past two and one-half decades we have accumulated a considerable amount of information on schools and other organizations in both the public and private sectors, which tends to suggest that school effectiveness when considered in terms of desired student outcomes is far more complex and difficult to measure than these oft-quoted aphorisms would lead us to believe. The most recent of these observations about schools was provided by Ronald Edmonds when he started the Effective Schools movement in the late 1970's. Edmonds suggested that while some of our casual observations about schools may be good ones, they are overly simplistic, unreliable and non-valid measures of school effectiveness. We must establish a set of school qualities which are at least related to student achievement. Then, we must implement policies and make decisions which will enhance the capacity of our local schools to become effective.

To increase the effectiveness of our schools we must take seven important steps. These steps are:

1. Define a clear set of outcomes we expect from our schools.
2. Define a set of school qualities which we believe promote student achievement gains.
3. Develop reliable and valid methods to measure these qualities.
4. Assess the presence or absence of these qualities in each of our schools.
5. Provide high quality and understandable information for parents, teachers and principals to use for building-based planning.
6. Provide the necessary resources for schools to use to successfully implement their plans.
7. Assure that future personnel have the necessary skills to function in an instructionally effective school.

The Seattle Effective Schools Project is an urban school project which has set forth these seven steps and is well on its way toward insuring that the goal of an instructionally effective school will be available for all children in the District. In the following sections, each of these steps, as it applies to Seattle's project, is presented.

STEP 1: DEFINE THE OUTCOMES EXPECTED

The goal of the Seattle School District Effective Schools Project is to insure that each child will have access to an instructionally effective school. Instructionally effective schools, as defined by the District, are productive in terms of student achievement. It is expected that all students will exhibit mastery of basic academic skills and will seek academic excellence in all subjects. Student achievement data will be analyzed by ethnicity, socio-economic status, and gender. There will be no identifiable differences between groups. While it is expected that students of higher ability and students of lesser ability will achieve at a different rate, one should not expect to find a different distribution of students by ethnicity, socio-economic status of the family or gender of the student.

STEP 2: DEFINE A SET OF QUALITIES OF A GOOD SCHOOL.

In terms of characteristics of a good school, it is expected that all schools in the Seattle School District will reflect (1) clear goals, (2) strong Leadership on the part of the principal, (3) dedication on the part of the school staff, (4) high expectations, (5) frequent monitoring of student progress, (6) early identification of learning difficulties, (7) positive learning climate, (8) time on task, (9) curriculum continuity, (10) multicultural education, (11) effective communication, and (12) parent/community involvement. It was expected that a research-based operation definition of each characteristic be developed, along with means and procedures for assessing the relative degreee of presence of each characteristic in each of the District's 99 schools.

STEP 3: IDENTIFY GOOD MEASURES OF THE QUALITIES OF A GOOD SCHOOL.

A number of urban school districts (e.g., New York, Milwaukee, St. Louis) have embarked on "effective schools" projects during the last several years. Seattle's project is similar to these efforts in specifying academic outcomes and defining an associated set of qualities of a good school. There are, however, two aspects in which Seattle's project differs: (1) Seattle expects participation of all schools in the District, rather than volunteer involvement of selected schools, and (2) unlike others, the Seattle project, from its inception, was planned with the intent of making the creation, application and diffusion of research knowledge an integral focus of the project.

Considering the system-wide, research-based scope of the project, Superintendent Donald Steele sought assistance from research institutions such as Michigan State, Ohio State University, and the University of Washington. It was decided that while Michigan State and Ohio State would provide consultative assistance from time to time, the University of Washington's College of Education would be the primary research and development link to the District. The decision to establish a primary relationship with the College of Education was based on availablity of research expertise; an expressed willingness on the part of both agencies to commit resources to the project; and geographical proximity.

On the basis of discussions among the Superintendent,the Dean of the College of Education, and other representatives of both agencies, a Memorandum of Understanding was developed; the memorandum, signed by the Superintendent and the Dean of the College of Education, established the basic guidlines under which University and District personnel work collaboratively in the conduct of research and development activities pertaining to the project over the next three years.

For example, an initial objective of the project was the development of research-based operational definitions of the 12 characteristics of a good school. To met this objective, twelve subgroups (one for each characteristic) were established jointly by Dr. Alice Houston, Assistant

Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, Seattle School District, and the author as Coordinator of the Effective Schools Project for the College of Education. Each subgroup consisted of several faculty members and District representatives who were assigned to groups on the basis of research expertise and expressed interest. One faculty member and one District representative were designated as co-heads of each subgroup; collectively, the co-heads served as members of the overall Task Force on Organizational Characteristics.

Nineteen faculty members and thirty-four District educators were involved in the effort, either as Task Force members or as members of subgroups.

Draft definitions were developed by the subgroups, and were reviewed and approved by the Task Force; definitions were submitted to Assistant Superintendent Houston for review in late May, 1983. Upon acceptance by the District, the subgroups identified and developed appropriate instruments and procedures to measure the relative degree of presence of each of the characteristics as defined in each of the 99 schools in the Seattle School District. Outlined below are the characteristics (qualities), how they are to be measured, and groups who will provide the information to be used to assess the qualities in the schools. Copies of measurement instruments can be obtained from either the School District or the University.

School Quality Desired	How Measured	Groups Providing Data
1. Clear Goals	• Congruence of expectations between parents, teachers and principal.	• All Parents All Teachers All Principals
2. Strong Leadership	• Principal's role in school communication network • Questions with Likert Scale response form	• All Teachers All Principals • All Teachers
3. Dedicated Staff	• Questions with Likert Scale response form	• All Teachers All Principals Central Office personnel
4. High Expectations	• Questions with Likert Scale Response Form • Locus of Control Instruments	• All Teachers All Principals • All Students
5. Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress	• Questions with Likert Scale Response Form • Direct Classroom Observation of Seatwork monitoring	• All Teachers • External Observers
6. Early Identification	• District Data Bank • School Data • Questions with Likert Scale Response Form	• Central Office • All Principals • All Teachers All Parents
7. Positive Learning Climate	• Questions with Likert Scale Response Form • Picture Identification Form	• All Students All Teachers All Parents • All Primary Grade Students
8. Time on Task	• Direct Classroom Observation of Students - two 20 min. observations per classroom	• External Observers probably pre-servic teacher interns
9. Curriculum Continuity Curriculum Alignment	• Questions with Likert Scale • Teacher checklist on objectives Teacher checklist on materials used Curr. Division analysis of curriculum materials Testing Office analysis of test materials v. objectives	• All Teachers • All Teachers • All Teachers • Curriculum Specialist in Central Off • Test Office Specialist in Central Off

10.. Multicultural Education	• Questions with Likert Scale Response Form	• All Teachers All Students except Primary
	• Questions with Picture Identification Response Form	• All Primary Grade Students
11. Communication	• Sociometric Communication Network Survey	• All Teachers All Principals
	• Questions with Likert Scale Response Form	• All Principals All Parents Central Office
12. Parent/Community Involvement	• Questions with Likert Scale Response Form	• All Parents
	• Yes/No type Questions with Follow-up Rating Scale of Satisfaction	• All Parents

STEP 4: ASSESS THE PRESENCE OR ABSENCE OF SCHOOL QUALITIES.

In May 1984 and in each subsequent year, it is expected that the principal and the Effective Schools Project (ESP) Teacher will be trained to gather local school data in each school. An ESP teacher is a teacher in each building who has been chosed to be a liaison person for the effective schools project and assist at the building level to promote the effectiveness of the project. It is expected that the ESP teacher will administered the teacher instruments during a regularly scheduled faculty meeting. Data will be gathered from students during regularly scheduled class time. And, parent surveys will be sent home and returned to school by elementary school parents. Surveys will be mailed to parents of secondary school students and return in a stamped envelope to the school district.

STEP 5: PROVIDE INFORMATION TO INDIVIDUAL SCHOOLS.

After the data has been collected, the Instructional Analysis Unit of the School District, the unit with responsiblity for research and evaluation functions for the District, in cooperation with the Effective Schools staff at the University will analyze and interpret the data for each school and prepare a school profile book. The school profile book will include separate sections on each of the 12 qualities. Included in each of these sections will be data on that school as well as a distribution which reflects the scores of all schools in the district on that characteristic. Included in each section will also be a review of the literature which summarizes our knowledge about that characteristic, student achievement data disaggregated by grade, gender, free and reduced lunch students, and ethnic group. The profile book will provide school principals, teachers and parents with a catalog of resources which are available for their use in improving their school. It is anticipated that each school will use its profile book as a basis for the development of both an annual and a long range school plan for improvement.

STEP 6: PROVIDE RESOURCES FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT.

To enhance the development of each school, school principals and teachers will be provided with resources they can use to improve their school. Although there is no guarantee that additional money will be available for local school use, we must think of resources in broader terms. For example, these resources might be courses at local colleges and universities that could be taken for credit, service organizations in the city or community which might be used for assistance in the school, expertise which might be used from other school principals and teachers in the Seattle School District, expertise of school principals and teachers in other school districts, external consultants from other college and universities, R and D Centers, or regional laborabories.

STEP 7: ASSURE THAT FUTURE SCHOOLS HAVE PERSONNEL WHO CAN FUNCTION IN INSTRUCTIONALLY EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS.

Our observations of school districts which have embarked on such school improvement efforts suggests that if such efforts are to be successful, provisions must be made to: (1) Screen personnel on their ability to perform in instructionally effective schools; (2) Provide inservice training and development of existing personnel; (3) Make provisions for the development and dissemination of quality information about effective schools; and (4) Commit a substantial portion of the operating budget (not less than 3% and preferably 5%) to developmental activities.

To assess the best way to achieve these objectives, the District and the University appointed a task force of individuals to propose a structure for training, development, demonstration and dissemination. The task force recommended that the District and the Unviersity establish an organization which would conduct these functions and blur the boundaries between the two organizations. The task force recommended the funding of an Institute for Effective Schools to be jointly operated by both agencies for the purpose of enhancing the creation and application of new knowledge though communication,interaction and information exchange between the

University and the District. The Institute would focus on the areas of (1) preserve and inservice training of teachers and administrators,(2) research, (3) curriculum development, and (4) demonstration and dissemination of practices which produce instructionally effective schools.

To the best of our knowledge,Seattle is unique in implementing an instructionally effective school project that (i) is system-wide, rather than involving elected schools, and (2) is research-based and assumes continual involvement of researchers as an integral function of the project.

The nature and scope of the project, and the success of the collaborative relationship with the University to date, affort signficant opportunities for generation of needed research knowledge pretaining to effective schools.

It is clear that such knowledge is needed. The extent and sophistication of research on effective schools and their associated characteristics are limited. Little is known as to the causal relationships between qualities of schools and student academic achievement. Most of the research to date has been correlational and ex post facto in nature. Many of the instruments for measuring the presence of given characteristics are subjective and of questionable reliability and validity.

The Seattle project will enable the conduct of well-controlled, scientific examination of the relationships between selected characteristics of schools and student academic achievement. Such an examination, coordinated through the Institute for Effective Schools over the next several years, will result in highly signficant contributions to the study and conduct of the schooling process. Research findings, disseminated through the Institute, will be of great benefit to the Seattle School District, the College of Education, and the larger education community throughout the nation.

THE CHALLENGE:

TRANSLATING POTENTIAL INTO PERFORMANCE

I. Review of major points made by Ellen Roe, T. J. Vassar and Richard Andrews.

A. Ellen Roe

1. Decision Seminar Process

2. Activities

3. Board Actions

a. Eleven Board policies

b. Consensus on definition

c. Many recommendations

B. T. J. Vassar

1. 12 Characteristics of Effective Schools

2. Major foci on urban environment

C. Richard Andrews

1. University(s) - School District collaboration

2. Major questions of importance to be answered

a. How do we provide effective schools?

b. How do we know when we have effective schools?

3. Uniqueness of Seattle Effective Schools Project

a. <u>All</u> school participate

b. Emphasis on creation, application, and dissemination of research

II. Board of Education and Administrative Challenges

A. Policy-Making Challenges

1. Input: Demands, expectations

2. Thru-Put: Policies alternatives debate

3. Output: Policies adopted

4. Outcomes: Reactions to policies

a. Substantial program cost increases; i.e., PRI, 6th period class, free summer school, and remediation/intervention program.

b. Substantial teacher union and administrative resistance.

c. Negotiations concerns.

B. Implementation challenges

1. Breaking down barriers of resistance

2. Converting potential into effective performance

by Donald J. Steele, Jr.
for NSBA Clinic
Sunday, April 1, 1984

PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTING INSTRUCTIONALLY EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS IN SEATTLE

The major responsibility for implementation rested with the Division of Curriculum and Instruction, and was postulated on four major elements:

1. Schools should uphold the ideals of a free society by promoting the common good and protecting the rights of individuals.

2. Educational programs should respond to the individual and collective needs of students.

3. Educators should constantly strive for excellence in their educational offerings.

4. Educators should plan and conduct programs that are feasible and appropriate to local conditions.

The following tasks were identified in attaining an instructionally effective school for each child:

1. Review of current Curriculum and Instruction services in terms of delivery of effective schools.

2. Development of means to assess attainment of the twelve characteristics of effective schools.

3. Development of a school performance appraisal system and school monitoring system.

4. Development of a public relations plan in relation to effective schools.

5. Development and implementation of diagnostic and assessment procedures for monitoring student achievement.

6. Development of research, development and training programs in conjunction with the University of Washington's College of Education.

7. Development of long-range building-based planning strategies.

Once the tasks were identified, the Curriculum and Instruction Division outlined the purposes, procedures, and timelines to be followed for each of the seven tasks to be accomplished.

CES.12